REMARKS

Claim 25 calls for a torsion spring that extends along the length of the housing and stays in spring biased contact with the reciprocating antenna. A torsion spring is explained in the attached appendix titled "Glossary of Spring Technology". As explained therein, a torsion spring applies a rotational energy or torque, in contrast to a compression spring that resists compression or stretching.

Clearly the spring 72 in Jones is a compression spring. Nonetheless, based on the sole teaching of Jones, claim 25 is rejected. It is suggested that Jones does mention that the spring can be "similar biasing means", citing column 10, lines 59-65. However, this is not what Jones says. He says the spring 72 "or a similar biasing means can be used to aid in the extension of a platform 30". A torsion spring could not aid in the extension of the platform 30. Therefore, there is no suggestion whatsoever in Jones to use a torsion spring, and to the contrary, it teaches away from using a torsion spring. Why it is believed that a torsion spring can be a similar biasing means is not explained. In fact, it does not appear that there is any way that a torsion spring could be used in the way that the spring 72 is used. Therefore, the application of the reference is insufficient to make out a *prima facie* rejection.

Similarly troubling is the rejection of claim 28. Claim 28 calls for both a torsion spring and a compression spring. But no reference showing either of these claimed elements is provided. Moreover, the suggestion to use a combination of these elements is not provided. The fact that Jones suggests that a compression spring is enough does not teach any reason to use a torsion spring as well. The fact that Sward also teaches a compression spring still fails to meet the limitations set forth in claim 28. That is not only because neither reference teaches a torsion spring but the combination of the two references teach no reason to use different types of springs.

Therefore, reconsideration would be appropriate.

With respect to the § 112 rejection, the compression spring 22 extends along the length of the housing 20. This is indisputable in Figure 3. It extends along the entire length of the housing. Moreover, it stays in contact with the housing at all times, as explained in the specification at page 7, lines 9-11. There it is stated that the torsion spring may comprise conductive material that provides electrical connection to the antenna when the antenna unit is either extended from or inserted into the communication module 10. Thus, it is clear that at all times, regardless of the

extension of the antenna, the spring stays in spring biased contact with the reciprocating antenna. Therefore, the spring both extends along the length of the housing and stays in contact, regardless of the position of the housing with the antenna. Reconsideration would be appropriate.

In view of these remarks, the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 6, 2008

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation